



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/031,287	05/17/2002	Timothy Jacob Jensen	12875.21USWO	2532
23552 7590 01/24/2007 MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			EXAMINER REDMAN, JERRY E	
			ART UNIT 3634	PAPER NUMBER

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/031,287

Applicant(s)

JENSEN, TIMOTHY JACOB

Examiner

Jerry Redman

Art Unit

3634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3634

Status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1-13 and 15-17 are herein addressed below; and

Claim 14 has been cancelled.

Claims 1-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, lines 10-12, and claim 8, lines 9-12, the phraseology "said first planar section has a first visible surface providing a first light/showdown effect and said second planar section has a second visible surface providing a second light/shadow effect" is not readily understood by the Examiner.

More specifically, what is meant by light/shadow effect for breaking visual experience?

On page 3, third paragraph, the applicant states what it is, but it is not readily understood by the Examiner how the change of direction/planar surface of a door can provide two different visual effects.

Claims 1-13 and 15-17 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. It is not readily understood by the Examiner how the change of direction/planar surface of a door can provide two different visual effects.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

As best understood, claims 1-7, 10, 12, 13, 15, and 17 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biebuyck. As shown in Figures 3B and 4, Biebuyck discloses an openable rectangular-shaped screen element (160 and 162; i.e., "fire door" having a space between two surfaces) for a building (152), having hinges (176A and 178A), and the screen elements have first and second planar sections (with one of the planar sections parallel with the building as shown in Figure 4) extending at an angle of about 30 degrees. Biebuyck further disclose rebates (172 and 174) and a locking means (column 8, lines 60-68, and element 478). Biebuyck fails to disclose the angle between the planar sections to be between 10-20 degrees. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the angle between the planar sections of Biebuyck to be between 10-20 degrees since one would still see oncoming traffic beyond the opening of the building and thus preventing the doors from extending too far into a sidewalk area.

As best understood, claims 9, 11, and 16 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biebuyck in view of Van Sandt. All of the elements


Art Unit: 3634

of the instant invention are discussed in detail above except providing a sensor lighting means and a closing means connected with a hinge. Van Sandt discloses a sensor lighting means and a closing means (Figures 3-5) connected with a hinge. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the screen element of Biebuyck with an automatic lighting means and a closing means as taught by Van Sandt since an automatic lighting means allows one to see individuals on an opposite side of a door when it's dark and a closing means allows the door to automatically close as one enters and exits the opening.

Claim 8 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13, and 15-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jerry Redman at telephone number 571-272-6835.


Jerry Redman
Primary Examiner